UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,983	05/03/2001	Michael James Dominic Skells	36-1432	7296

7590   09/22/2004

Nixon & Vanderhye
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER
DALENCOURT, YVES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/830,983	SKELLS, MICHAEL JAMES DOMINIC
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yves Dalencourt	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 May 2001_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _05/03/01_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 05/03/01.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Therefore, "comprises " (page 20, line 4) is implied; and should be avoided.

Please delete " Network Management System " (page 20, line 2).

Please delete " Figure (1) " (page 20, line 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Srisuresh et al (US 6,058,431; hereinafter Srisuresh).

Regarding claims 1 - 3, Srisuresh teaches a method of routing data elements

transmitted along a transmission path between an original source address and an

original destination address, said data elements comprising an indication of source

address and an indication of destination address (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 44 – 54), said

method comprising the steps of at a first point in the transmission path (A, fig. 2)

receiving a first data element (col. 2, lines 36 - 41); modifying the original source

address to an alternative source address (col. 5, lines 51 – 67; Srisuresh discloses an

original source = 10.0.0.5 and an alternative source = 198.76.29.1); modifying the

original destination address to an alternative destination address (col. 6, lines 1 – 3;

Srisuresh discloses an original destination address = 198.76.28.4 and an alternative

destination address = 198.76.29.1); and re-transmitting the first data element on the

transmission path (col. 6, lines 3 – 11; Srisuresh discloses that the router 106 forwards

the datagram to workstation 108a so that the original session on PC 108a can receive

their reply); and at a second point in the transmission path corresponding to the

alternative source address (D, fig. 2) receiving a second data element having the

alternative source address as its destination address (col. 6, lines 27 – 29; Srisuresh

discloses that if a reply should come back, it would contain a destination IP address of

198.76.29.1); modifying the destination address to the original source address and

modifying the source address to the original destination address (col. 6, lines 29 - 32);

and re-transmitting the second data element along the transmission path (col. 6, lines

32 – 34 and lines 58 - 67).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Srisuresh teaches a method of routing data elements

transmitted along a transmission path between an original source address and an

original destination address, which further comprises the step of storing the original

source address, original destination address, alternative source address and the

alternative destination address said stored addresses indicating an existing routing path

for data elements having source and destination addresses matching the stored original

source and destination addresses (col. 5, lines 19 – 67; col. 6, lines 1 – 11; Srisuresh

discloses a router 106, which inherently stores and matches the original source,

destination, and alternative addresses).

Regarding claim 11, Srisuresh teaches a computer program or suite of computer

programs comprising instructions for causing one or more computers to carry out the

method according to claim 1 (col. 8, lines 6 – 56).

Regarding claims 6 - 8, Srisuresh teaches an apparatus for routing data elements transmitted along a transmission path between an original source address and an original destination address, said data elements comprising an indication of source address and an indication of destination address (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 44 – 54), said apparatus comprising a first means arranged at a first point in the transmission path (A, fig. 2) operable to receive a first data element (col. 2, lines 36 - 41); modify the original source address to an alternative source address (col. 5, lines 51 – 67; Srisuresh discloses an original source = 10.0.0.5 and an alternative source = 198.76.29.1); modify the original destination address to an alternative destination address (col. 6, lines 1 – 3; Srisuresh discloses an original destination address = 198.76.28.4 and an alternative destination address = 198.76.29.1); and re-transmit the first data element on the transmission path (col. 6, lines 3 – 11; Srisuresh discloses that the router 106 forwards the datagram to workstation 108a so that the original session on PC 108a can receive their reply); and second means arranged at a second point (D, fig. 2) in the transmission path having the alternative source address operable to receive a second data element having the alternative source address as its destination address (col. 6, lines 27 – 29; Srisuresh discloses that if a reply should come back, it would contain a destination IP address of 198.76.29.1); modify the destination address to the original source address and modify the source address to the original destination address (col. 6, lines 29 - 32); and re-transmit the second data element along the transmission path (col. 6, lines 32 – 34 and lines 58 - 67).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Srisuresh teaches an apparatus according to claim 6 further comprising means operable to store the original source address, original destination address, alternative source address and the alternative destination address said stored addresses indicating an existing routing path for data elements having source and destination addresses matching the stored original source and destination addresses (col. 5, lines 19 – 67; col. 6, lines 1 – 11; Srisuresh discloses a router 106, which inherently stores and matches the original source, destination, and alternative addresses).

Regarding claim 12, Srisuresh teaches computer program or suite of computer programs comprising instructions for causing one or more computers to provide the apparatus according to claim 6 (col. 8, lines 6 – 56).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Oehrke et al (US Patent Number 6,735,631) discloses a method and system for networking redirecting.

Applegate et al (US Patent Number 6,321,336) discloses a system and method for redirecting network traffic to provide secure communication.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (703) 308-8547. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt

September 13, 2004

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100